DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 637 CG 010 141

AUTHOR Verheyden-Hilliard, Mary E.
TITLE The State of the Girl Child.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association (52nd, Washington, D.C., March 22-24, 1975); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Feminism; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Stereotypes; *Socialization; Speeches

ABSTRACT

Expectations for childhood and its outcome take on quite different meanings when one designates the child as female. A girl needs an Affirmative Action Childhood to counteract the intensive, pervasive, and crippling socialization process which negatively and powerfully affects her aspirations, and, therefore, her future as an adult. Included in an Affirmative Action Childhood should be the need to help boys give up their contemptuous, superior attitudes toward females which is allowed and reinforced in childhood, and which pervasively affects all their later adult relationships with women whether on a professional or a personal level. Approval of equal pay for equal work, and equal employment and educational opportunity are, of course, necessary. But the nuances of sexism which train girls not even to aspire to equal employment and equal educational opportunity must also be dealt with if the vicious circle is ever to break. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113637

THE STATE OF THE GIRL CHILD

Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard

National Coordinator
Education Task Forces
National Organization for Women

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary E. Verheyden-Hilliard
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Paper presented at the 52nd Annual Meeting of
The American Orthopsychiatric Association
March 22-24, 1975, New York, New York

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG 010 141

Copyright By the Author

Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard
National Organization for Women
6 South Wabash, Suite 1615
Chicago, Illinois 60603

1/

The opening sentence of the theme statement of the 52nd Annual Meeting of The American Orthopsychiatric Association says that "the value a country sets on its children is an index of that country's level of civilization." The word "children" like the generic "mankind" is used here and elsewhere as though it referred to both males and females equally. In reality, it rarely does. Our expectations for childhood and the outcome of childhood take on quite different meanings when one expressly designates the "child" as female.

I suggest that the value that this country places on the female half of its child population is that of a potentially valuable servant in the dictionary definition sense of "one who serves others." I suggest we have refined a socialization process which trains girls to accept that role and which trains boys to expect girls to stay in that role. Cara Richards, the anthropologist and author, has written:

> Enculturation and socialization are vital for the maintenance of a society, since certain tasks must be performed for any society to continue to exist. . . .To ensure the performance of these necessary tasks people must want to do what has to be done. [1]

The "necessary tasks" that girls are being socialized to want to do are the serving tasks dedicated to the care of their future husbands and children. This required socialization to a secondary, supportive role will ultimately place our daughters in the position of a satelite person revolving around and in reflected glory of someone else's life. These serving tasks extend and continue in the female intensive occupations--nurse serving patient and doctor, teacher serving children, secretary serving boss. It is not coincidental that 52 percent of women working are in clerical or service fields and by service is

meant beautician, waitress and so on. Or that of all professional women 50 percent are elementary and secondary school teachers.[2] These jobs are the moveable parts of the occupational world. Geared to start, stop and move to meet the server's responsibility to the family in regard to child care and the moves that may be necessary to further a husband's career.

Even highly educated women with on-going careers are expected to put their husband's careers before their own as well as to be ultimately responsible for the emotional and physical well-being of the family as differentiated from, although dependent upon, the financial well-being.

These are roles, sex roles, that our daughters are trained to take. And why? No one has isolated a gene marked "child care" as differentiated from one marked "child bearing." Neither is there a sex-related gene marked "housework." Children need parenting and houses need cleaning and nowhere is it written that these jobs can be done only by people with uteruses.

But our daughers and sons are brought up to believe otherwise.

A girl is socialized to serve, lovingly, and in exchange, if she is pleasing enough, she will hope to find someone who will "take care of her" by pursuing the important job or career. It will be dependence, not independence, which will be her crowning glory.

We have, in short, come nowhere at all since Mary Wollstonecraft wrote a book 200 years ago called The Vindication of the Rights of Women in which she said:

> . . . .Gentleness, docility, and a spaniel-life affection are. . .consistently recommended as the cardinal virtues of the sex. . . .She was created to be the toy of man, his rattle, and it must jingle in his ears whenever, dismissing reason, he chooses to be amused. [3]

We have so long been raising girls to those specifications that, as Simone de Beauvoir has written, we have managed to "produce in women moral and intellectual effects so profound that they appear to spring from her original nature." [4] They were not there in the beginning.

Sigmund Freud said, "One gets the impression that little girls are more intelligent and livelier than boys of the same age." He said, "The aggressive impulses of little girls leave nothing to be desired in the way of abundance and violence. . . .The differences between the sexes are completely eclipsed by their agreements." [5]

However, to train the servant to her role society works hard to extinguish that kind of behavior in girls. Hardly anyone wants their son to be called "Momma's Boy" but "Daddy's Girl" sounds just fine conjuring up as it does visions of pliancy, lap-top flirtation and rewards handed out at a very early age for the ability to be sweet, manipulative and dependent. We socialize very young boys to be independent, fierce and brave--but not "Daddy's Girl."

One of the funniest efforts to portray little girls as naturally subservient was set forth by Freud himself when he made some interesting assumptions about toilet training. He noted that girls are able to make use of the bathroom sooner than boys and he attributed this to "pliancy" on the part of the girl. It had nothing to do with her ability to use her intelligence and the muscular control

which girls usually gain sooner than boys to make herself comfortable. Certainly not. It was "pliancy." Boys, however, are asserting their wills, showing their strength of character and independence by refusing to use the bathroom and using their diapers instead. [6]

According to Dr. Freud soggy pants shows strength of character and dry pants shows pliancy. It is the beginning of a long haul for the little girl watching her abilities go unrecognized and demeaned.

She goes to nursery school, this lively intelligent assertive person that Dr. Freud had noticed and again, in another way, she is often told she is weak and incapable. She is asked to deny what her body and mind tell her in order to play the sex role of "little girl."

Here comes Mary to complain to the teacher that she is being bothered by Johnny. Does teacher say, "Listen, you're as big as Johnny —even a little bigger. Go back and stand up for yourself. You don't have to be afraid of him." Certainly not. Teacher says, "Now, you don't need to play with Johnny. Boys play rough. Boys play differently than little girls. If you don't want to get hurt, stay away." Parenthetically, of course, if Johnny should run to teacher with the same complaint, we may be assured that he would be told to stand up for himself, to be brave.

Little girls up to puberty at least are as big and strong as boys of the same age and often bigger and stronger because girls' growth spurt comes sooner. Why does the teacher tell the girl to retreat, to be fearful, to stay away? It isn't necessary. It isn't reality. But it is expected. The girl learns that she is expected to pretend that she is weak, even if she isn't; that she must not fight for her rights with males even if her rights are being usurped; that head-to-head

contention with males is not something that is appropriate for females; and that she must manipulate the situation by getting someone else to stand up for her because no boy need listen to her. And what she is learning little boys are also learning every step of the way.

Boys are learning that they need pay no attention to their female peers unless someone else tells them they must. They are learning who is the last socially acceptable scapegoat, the last group which our society allows and encourages them, by birth, to feel superior towards. This superior attitude toward females, allowed and reinforced in childhood will affect all their later relationships with adult women whether on a professional or a personal level.

In case the little girl doesn't get enough socialization to satelite person in her personal relationships, she can always turn on the T.V. I did a study on "The Images of Females on Saturday Morning Children's Television Programs" monitoring for five hours of a Saturday for four consecutive Saturdays. I recommend it to you as an educational experience. If a girl watches the Saturday morning children's programs, she will see herself following the boys around, watching them have adventures. She will see herself failing and being rescued by some boy. She will see adult women portrayed as nags and shrews whom nobody likes, not their children, not their husbands and they rarely have any friends.

The little girl can turn off the TV and go to the toy shop for something to cheer her up. She will look in vain for the female picture on the box that will tell her that an active or intellectual toy is appropriate for her. It is her brother's picture that is on

the science sets, the more adult games and the sports equipment. Her picture is on "her" toys--the boxes that contain the toy brooms, babies, sinks, stoves and hair dryers. The server must learn to serve and to look attractive while doing it.

Eric Erikson, philosopher and analyst, says that the most important thing children should be developing at this pre-school stage is initiative. Initiative is a necessity for whatever a child wants to do from fruit gathering, to a system of enterprise, to painting, to inventing. First one must have the initiative to start before anything can be done. But it turns out that Erikson, like others, doesn't really mean children. He means boys. He splits the children of his stage three of development into boys and girls and speaks for boys of the pleasure in attack and conquest, by which I take him to mean meeting a problem and conquering it. In girls, however, this pleasure in attack and conquest becomes in Erikson's words "'catching' in the more aggressive form of snatching or in the milder form of making oneself attractive and endearing." [7]

Why may not little girls simply attack a problem as Erikson suggests little boys should do at this stage? Why must they "snatch" at a problem. Further, setting for a pre-school girl the developmental task of making herself "attractive and endearing" is almost obscene. One has only to transpose that mandate to a pre-school boy and set his developmental task not at intellectual and physical development but at only making himself attractive and charming to know how warped is a societal or philosophical concept that wants to start training

its sex objects to the proper behavior while they are still in nursery school.

Like little girls in Old China whose feet were bound until the bones were broken and mangled and the girl or woman could never move freely again, our girls find their exuberance, initiative and assertiveness bound in by small and large societal expectations of what is "proper" for little girls to do. Having lost that freedom of physical and intellectual movement and choice in their early years, they are forever curtailed.

But what happens when the little girl enters the educational setting where she will be required to spend five days a week, nine months of the year for at least ten years? Surely the State is not training her to be a server. Consider these quotes from a magazine article lauding a sex segregated elementary school class:

> From studying the atom a boy's class moved easily into a study of nuclear fission. It is unlikely that girls would respond this way.
>
> Mold can be studied from a medical standpoint by boys and in terms of cooking by girls.
>
> For girls, we use quieter games, fairy stories, and games and songs which emphasize activities such as sewing and housekeeping.[8]

So on those educational continuums which run from science at one end to salad at the other, we can see where the educators have placed all girls regardless of interest or capability--and certainly irrespective of the damage this pigeonholing might do to a child's own aspirations, self concept and mental health. "Daddy's Girl" is to cook and sew and keep house. Excessive interest in nuclear fission or medicine might dilute her enthusiasm for the limitations of her designated sex role.

We train the servers and we train those who will be served. We have all seen the little girl pushed aside by the little boys who take over the playground at recess and refuse to allow her to join their games. We have seen the teachers, counselors and administrators allow the boys to do it. Most educators, nowadays, would have some problems watching a group of boys shove aside and refuse to play with members of a cultural or ethnic minority. But girls are different. They are the last acceptable scapegoat.

The teachers use it themselves. "If you are not good, you will have to sit with the girls." Try "If you are not good, you'll have to sit with the Blacks." Try setting up a spelling contest by saying "Today we are going to play the Blacks against the Whites." Try "I want the Blacks to line up on this side and the Whites on this side and that's the way I want you to line up to come in or go out of the classroom every day." Try "Good morning, Blacks and Whites."

We used to like to say that it was practically instinctive that boys wouldn't play with girls--the latency period and all that. Today with the advent of the free school and the open classroom encouraging cooperative behavior among all students, it is impossible to pretend that boys and girls cannot work and play together happily and successfully in elementary school. Boys and girls will work and play together when adults tell them it is all right and support and encourage that behavior.

But even among enlightened educators the variations of the sweet little, weak little "Daddy's Girl" syndrome die hard. When the

teacher asks her eight year old boys to bring the milk from the refrigerator down the hall while assigning the girls to pass out the napkins, she or he is reinforcing stereotypic occupations for girls and boys. And if the teacher says s/he does it because boys are "stronger", then girls are being taught once more to shut their eyes to reality and to act out what society requires rather than what their senses tell them is true. Most elementary school girls are as large or larger than their male classmates.[9] But the message to deny one's capabilities will sink in with the rest of the proscriptions. The helpless female isn't born. She is raised.

And the boy is being raised too. He is spending all of his formative years absorbing the message that it is not appropriate for him to work or play with a girl as an equal. He is told that it is more appropriate for him to be with the boys. He has even been told that it is a disgrace to sit with the girls and that any game he plays will become less if a girl takes part. Why should anyone expect him to grow up to be a man who feels comfortable with women who are competent, skillful equals? If a woman does the job, it must be of less worth; therefore, we must keep them out to keep our prestige up.

Bruno Bettelheim has said that in these early years, it is rare indeed for girls to hear the slightest suggestion that they might one day do the interesting work of the world quite as well as a man, or even better.[10]

It is no wonder, then, that studies show that boys in elementary school have better feelings about being male. They have opportunities to demonstrate their confidence and assertiveness. Girls,

however, feel less confident about their accomplishments and adequacy. They are not very happy about being female either.[11] And why should they be? They can't do this and they can't do that. They aren't wanted here and they are pariahs there. Stretching and reaching and asserting and moving is not what they can do. It is what they can watch boys do. Who wouldn't rather be a boy?

It becomes not so surprising in view of the message of the adults, the media, the textbooks, and the world that studies indicate that by the fourth grade--age NINE--girls have limited their choice of career to four--nurse, teacher, secretary and mother. At the same age boys are expanding their choices to everything from deep sea diver to president to astronaut and including doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief.[12]

Ginzberg, in his theory of occupational choice, postulates that we all make our occupational choices by first going through a dreaming stage until about the age of 12. From 12 to 17 years of age, we try on a variety of roles and at age 17 we make a realistic choice.[13] It would appear that like many other theories, his theory of occupational choice was made with only half the population in mind. Girls don't even dare to dream. Nurse, Secretary, Teacher, Mother. All boxed in by age nine.

Of course those are all good and worthwhile occupations. But wouldn't we think it odd if all the boys in America had but four occupations in mind: medical assistant, clerical worker, teacher and father? Wouldn't we think it odd to find no aspiring presidents or doctors or lawyers?

And again this limiting of choice has nothing to do with reality or ability. Girls do very well in elementary school. They read sooner and better than boys. They are more verbally skillful and in elementary school they are better in math.[14] But "Daddy's Girl" has learned her lesson well. She is to be a server, an attendant, a nurturer and she is certainly not supposed to mix into the boys "games" like lawyer, president, astronaut or doctor. And as her teacher has been telling her, as the boys have been telling her, as society has been telling her--even if she knows she has the strength or ability to do something that doesn't mean anybody is going to expect her to do it or that anybody wants her to try to do it. So play it safe, nine year old, stay in your place, dream nothing and risk nothing. Daddy's Girl knows where she belongs.

Research tells us that female under-achievement begins at about puberty. At puberty adult roles are being studied and adapted to. The Ginzberg theory of occupational choice applies here--young people are trying on roles. Erikson says that the critical problem of adolescence is the problem of identity. He speaks of one's meaning as evidenced in the tangible promise of a career in view. But what does "career" mean for girls. Studies have shown that when girls expressed an interest in engineering as a career, even though they had the necessary academic ability for that career, counselors, both men and women, saw them as "deviant." Home economics was seen as a more appropriate career. Girls who chose engineering were seen as in need of counseling--not because they needed help to achieve their goal but because something was seen to be deviant about them and their goal.[15]

In a large survey of sex role attitudes of ninth grade children who were from majority and minority groups and all social economic classes, children were asked if they thought wives should work. The greatest difference in attitude was between middle class girls who said "yes," and middle class boys who said "no." The disparity of attitudes became even greater between those boys and girls of high I.Q. That is, the higher the boy's I.Q. went, the more likely he was to have already decided at age 14 that he wanted his wife at home.[16] If I.Q. is any predictor of capability at all, this study is indicating that those girls with the most potential capability are the ones most likely to be married to persons who will not want them to utilize their capability. One interesting difference in attitude shown by these young people was that holding I.Q. and social class constant, the black male ninth graders were more accepting than their white counterparts to having wives with careers.

The Broverman study[17] which attempted to determine what clinically trained psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers saw as a prototype "healthy" woman discovered that the clinicians thought women <u>should be</u> less aggressive, less competitive, more excitable in minor crises, more emotional, more conceited about their appearance, less objective and disliking math and science. This would seem to fit very well with how girls at adolescence are expected to behave. They are being trained to fit the societal myths that women are childlike, emotional, incapable of rational decisions and not interested in demanding careers. Girls are socialized and expected to behave in this stereotypic "feminine" manner. They are criticized if they don't and damned as "silly" if they do.

The state of the girl child at adolescence is one of intense pressure to pull back into the satelite position as preparation for her future role. What independence she had is now turned in and her total self worth depends on which boy or how many boys find her worthy. She tries on the career of the wife at home as she waits passively by the phone for a call from a male that will tell her that she's "all right." She is encouraged to flatter the budding male adolescent and to trim her talents carefully so that they will not outshine those of the boy. We talk of generic adolescence as a time of asserting independence, of finding one's own values, but once more we are not talking about girls. Girls at adolescence trade in dependence on their parents for dependence on their male friends and eventually they will trade in that for dependence on a husband. We do not foster independence in girls at this time. How is it that clinicians, educators and lay persons alike tend to think this is an acceptable way for girls to behave?

If we knew of a society which routinely and traditionally taught its boys to pretend they were dumb, to not strive to do everything they could with their intellectual and physical capabilities, to plan their lives to maintaining the lives of their families rather than to creating lives of their own, would we really believe that all of this suppressive behavior would have no effect on the mental health of those boys?

As Census Bureau statistics indicate, 2 out of 3 teenage runaways are girls. The wonder is not that so many girls grow up to lead lives of quiet desperation and desperation. The wonder is that we are not all raving mad.

Independence, of course, need not preclude marriage and children. But it will likely include them in a different way. Mary Wollstonecraft spoke 200 years ago of the shallowness and danger in educating girls to believe that beauty, charm and submissive pleasingness will bring lasting happiness. She said instead that a "perfect education" would render the girl—and the woman she was to become--"independent." It really is the only way a woman can be sure that she is spending her life with a person because she continues to want to rather than because she has nowhere else to go.

We have to stop socializing girls to be servers with incidental jobs that are not real careers. It is cavalier at best and cruel at worst to allow them to believe that there is no need for them to plan a careful education for a life-time occupation or career. The facts are:

- o if a woman does not marry she can expect to work for an average of 45 years;[18]
- o if she does marry, she can expect to work for an average of 25 years;[19]
- o since 1940 the numbers of married women who work are up 320 percent;[20]
- o there are 7.4 million women working with school age children;[21]
- o there are 4.8 million working women with pre-school children;[22]
- o in the last decade the divorce rate is up 109 percent and rising;[23] and
- o the majority of old people who are poor are women.[24]

One needs an extremely accurate crystal ball to be able to tell a girl anything but that she had better be prepared to be independent.

The question raised by the theme of the conference--"How do we provide necessary services for those children and their families who in addition need specialized forms of assistance to achieve their maximum potential?"--is a question which must be read to also mean girl children as a special group. What girl children need, at this point in time, is an Affirmative Action Childhood to counteract the intensive and crippling socialization process which pervades their lives whether at home, in school, in therapy, in relations with adults, in the media, wherever they turn. If allowed to continue uninterrupted, it will powerfully and negatively affect their self concept, their aspirations and, therefore, their future.

As Alice Rossi has pointed out, the "childhood model of the quiet, good sweet girl will not produce any women scientists, scholars, doctors or engineers."[25] Girls are rewarded for being quiet, following directions and being "good." Being quiet, following directions and being "good" are not the attributes of the achiever or the creator.

The Fels Study--a longitudinal study of gifted people who were identified as gifted very early in their lives and who have been followed for a matter of several decades--showed that the girls and boys whose I.Q.'s rose during elementary school were the children who were "competitive, self-assertive, independent and dominant in interaction with other children." The children whose I.Q.'s declined during the same period were "passive, shy and dependent." It does not take a great deal of scholarly thought to figure out which list of

adjectives suit the current view of the female role in elementary school--and elsewhere. Even more precisely, Maccoby asked the Fels people, "What sort of developmental history was necessary to make a girl into an intellectual person." They replied, "The simplest way to put it is that she must be a tomboy at some point in her childhood." [26]

The Fels people were probably not implying that climbing a tree once a day was going to produce an intellectual. But "tomboy-ishness" in a girl means that her life has not been proscribed and her view of what her "role" is has not been prescribed and locked in. What that may mean is that she feels free to choose and to grow. She is not already socialized into a damaging preconceived idea of what is "appropriate" for girls to do. Her mind and body are free to go as fast and as far as her capability will allow. We must actively encourage that freedom and that growth.

That means that a girl must be seen as a person first and not someone's future wife or mother. She must be accepted on an absolutely equal basis in terms of behavior and expectations of behavior.

We have to help the little girl and the young woman counteract the self hatred and feeling of unworthiness the advertising media directs at her, when it tells her she must "make up" for all her shortcomings. With every turn of the dial and flip of the page she is told that nothing about herself could possibly be acceptable--not her hair, her skin, her size, her body--she needs must move in a cloud of internal and external deoderants in order for society to tolerate her. As Marya Mannes pointed out some time ago, nobody expected

George Eliot to be a beauty or worried about Joan of Arc's haircut. Nobody urged Marie Curie to dye her hair. [27]

"Daddy's Girl" must become as much of a putdown as "Momma's Boy." She must be encouraged to never make herself less in order to make a boy or a man appear to be more. She needs to be encouraged to consider what sort of boy or man needs her to be less in order to make himself more.

We must stop raising "Daddy's Girl" to act dumb, childlike, helpless and subservient in order to attract the eye of Prince Charming. The unspoken but basic belief in the Cinderella Myth may be doing more to thwart the development of the full potential of girls than we are ready to face. But face it we must. People sincerely believe that every American girl is named Cinderella and that after she leaves school at whatever level, she will only have to work for a little while until Prince Charming sweeps her off her feet. Then she will never have to work or want to work again. She and her Prince will live happily ever after until they are both 100 years old at which time they will both die on the same day. That is the myth. The reality is that Prince Charming doesn't live here any more.

To repeat the statistics once more:

- forty percent of the total American work force are women; [28]
- even if a woman remains married, she can expect to work for an average of 25 years (45 years if she remains single); [29]

- o even if she has children, she can expect to work. (Thirteen million women in the labor force are women with children. [30]);
- o even with pre-school children, 4.8 million women work; [31]
- o one out of ten of all women in the labor force are presently heads of families and one out of five minority women are heads of families; [32]
- o the divorce rate is up 109 percent since 1962 and rising; [33]
- o fathers by and large contribute less than half the support of children in divided families and enforcement of payment is nearly non-existent; [34]
- o the median income of a fully employed woman with a college degree is less than that of a fully employed man with an eighth grade education; [35]
- o the longevity rate of women has increased 20.6 years in the last 50 years while the men's rate has increased only 13.8 years; [36]
- o men outnumber women in admissions to mental institutions two to one and have twice as many ulcers; [37] and
- o the majority of old people who are poor are women. [38]

Remember that the children we know will spend most of their adult lives in the 21st Century, a world we may never see and can barely imagine. If we are to free children--the boys and the girls--to live in <u>this</u> century, let alone in that 21st Century, one thing is clear--

socializing them for the 19th Century roles of Prince Charming and Cinderella is only to invite disaster.

Societies, both now and in the past, have not only allowed but encouraged girls to grow into bonsai women, pinched off, shaped, decorated, meant to fit into a home without too much trouble. That must stop. A new approach which will allow for truly natural and strong growth must begin. The girl child must be encouraged to aspire and be taught that independence is her strength as it is for a man.

It is a scary prospect. Independent women have never been fostered by society and we need to ask why. What are we afraid will happen if women can choose in exactly the same way that men can choose? What are we afraid will happen if we raise our girls to hold equal access to the seats of power whether in government, industry, church or labor? Why have we worked so hard to keep girls and women in their place and is "keep" the right word because we knew that otherwise they wouldn't stay?

Citing a study done by the Vaertings in 1923, (sic) Dr. Jesse Bernard writes:

> . . .What we consider to be archtypically feminine, passivity in love making, obedience, submissiveness to commands, and rules, dependence on spouse, fearfulness, modesty, chastity, bashfulness, maidenly reserve, love of home, restricted outside interest, tender care for babies, monogamic inclination, interest in bodily adornment, and love of finery--were merely the qualities of subordinates, wherever, whenever, male or female. [emphasis mine]. [39]

We must stop raising girls to be subordinates, even loving subordinates. And we must stop raising boys to expect them to be so.

Childbirth is now defined by the law as a temporary disability. Child care can be done by either a loving mother or a loving father. The state of the girl child is interdependent with the state of the boy child as the state of the woman will be interdependent with the state of the man.

I believe that when we have given girls the space and encouragement they need to grow freely and completely and boys the reassurance and support they need not to be threatened by that growth and freedom, we may have done more for the quality of future life than we can presently envision.

1. Richards, C.E. Man in Perspective, New York: Random House, 1972.

2. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. We The American Women. Washington, D.C. 1973.

3. Wollstonecraft, M. A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1967.

4. de Beauvoir, S. The Second Sex, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1953.

5. Freud, S. New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. Translated and edited by James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1964.

6. Freud, op. cit.

7. Erikson, E. Childhood and Society, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950.

8. Lyles, T. "Grouping by Sex" National Elementary Principal, 46, November, 1966.

9. National Organization for Women, Essex County, New Jersey Chapter v. Little League Baseball, Inc. Supplemental findings, determination and order. State of New Jersey, Department of Law and Public Safety, Division of Civil Rights, Docket No. AJ05SB-0494, January, 1974. P. 32

10. Bettelheim, B. "Growing Up Female" Harper's, October, 1962.

11. Minuchin, P. "Sex Difference in Children: Research Findings in an Education Context," National Elementary Principal, 46, 1966.

12. Iglitzin, L. "A Child-Eye View of Sex Roles," a paper presented at the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C. 1972, cited in Frazier, N. & Sadker, M. Sexism in Schools and Society, New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

13. Ginzberg, E. "Toward a Theory of Occupational Choice" Occupations 30, April, 1952.

14. Maccoby, E. "Sex Difference in Intellectual Function," Maccoby, E. (Ed.) The Development of Sex Differences, Stanford: Stanford Press, 1960.

15. Thomas, A.H. & Stewart, N.W. "Counselor Response to Female Clients with Deviant and Conforming Career Goals," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 1971.

16. Entwisle, D.R. & Greenberger, E.A. A survey of Cognitive Styles in Maryland Ninth Graders: A view of Women's Roles. The Johns Hopkins University Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Report No. 89. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970.

17. Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.A. & Vogel, S.R. "Sex Role Stereotypes and Clinical Judgements of Mental Health," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, February, 1970.

18. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. The myth and the reality. May 1974 (revised), Washington, D.C.

19. Ibid.

20. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, We The American Women, Washington, D.C. 1973.

21. Ibid.

22. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. Highlights of women's employment and education. June 1974 (revised), Washington, D.C.

23. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Health Statistics. Provision statistics 1974, Rockville, Md.

24. National Council on the Aging, Inc., The National Institute of Industrial Gerontology. Industrial Gerontology, 1(2), Spring 1974.

25. Rossi, A. "Who Wants Women in the Scientific Professions?" in Mattfel, J.A. (Ed.) Women in the Scientific Professions. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965.

26. Maccoby, E. "Women's Intellect" in Farber, S. (Ed.) The Potential of Women. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1963.

27. Mannes, M. "The Problems of Creative Women," in Farber, S. (Ed.) The Potential of Women. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1963.

28. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. Twenty Facts on women workers. June 1974, Washington, D.C.

29. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. The myth and the reality. May 1974 (revised), Washington, D.C.

30. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. Highlights of women's employment and education. June 1974 (revised), Washington, D.C.

31. Ibid.

32. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. Twenty facts on women workers. June 1974, Washington, D.C.

33. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Health Statistics. Provisional statistics 1974. Rockville, Md.

34. Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. The equal rights amendments alimony and child support laws. January 1972, Department of Labor Building, Washington, D.C.

35. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau. The earning gap: median earnings of year-round full-time workers, by sex. March 1975, Washington, D.C.

36. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Provisional statistics 1974.

37. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health, Biometrics Division. Sex ratio of the male to female admission rate to state and county mental hospitals, United States, in Statistical Note 97, Table 4, p. 7. September 1973. Rockville, Md.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Center for Health Statistics, Division of Health Survey-Interview Statistics, #1083. Survey of incidence of stomach ulcers in males and females in 1968. September 1973. Rockville, Md.

38. National Council on the Aging, Inc., The National Institute of Industrial Gerontology. Industrial Gerontology, 1(2), Spring 1974.

39. Bernard, J. Women and the Public Interest, Chicago: Aline-Atherton, Inc., 1971.